

Comment on “Bicritical and Tetracritical Phenomena and Scaling Properties of the SO(5) Theory”

Pasquale Calabrese¹, Andrea Pelissetto², Ettore Vicari³

¹ *Scuola Normale Superiore and I.N.F.N., Piazza dei Cavalieri 7, I-56126 Pisa, Italy.*

² *Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Roma I and I.N.F.N., I-00185 Roma, Italy.*

³ *Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and I.N.F.N., Via Buonarroti 2, I-56127 Pisa, Italy.*

e-mail: calabres@df.unipi.it, Andrea.Pelissetto@roma1.infn.it, vicari@df.unipi.it.

(February 1, 2008)

We show that, in the most general N -component theory with symmetry $O(n_1) \oplus O(n_2)$, $N = n_1 + n_2 \geq 3$, the $O(N)$ -symmetric fixed point has (at least) three unstable directions: the temperature, the quadratic anisotropy, and the spin-4 quartic perturbation. This implies that in the SO(5) theory of high- T_c superconductivity an additional tuning is required to obtain an enlarged SO(5) symmetry. This is in contrast with the recent numerical results reported by Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 057004 (2001).

Interesting multicritical phenomena arise from the competition of distinct types of ordering [1]. According to the SO(5) theory [2] of high- T_c superconductivity, the SO(5) symmetry is realized at a bicritical point, where two critical lines merge: one is related to an antiferromagnetic order and SO(3) symmetry, the other one to a d -wave superconducting order and U(1) symmetry. Evidence in favor of this scenario has been recently presented by Hu [3,4], who reported Monte Carlo (MC) simulations for a five-component spin model. He concluded that the multicritical point describing the simultaneous SO(3) and U(1) ordering is a bicritical point belonging to the O(5) universality class (when the parameters of the model are in the region relevant for the high- T_c superconductivity).

Multicritical phenomena in an N -component system have been studied by considering the most general N -component Hamiltonian with symmetry $O(n_1) \oplus O(n_2)$ containing up to quartic terms, i.e. [1]

$$\mathcal{H} = \int d^d x \left\{ \frac{1}{2} [(\partial_\mu \phi_1)^2 + (\partial_\mu \phi_2)^2 + r_1 \phi_1^2 + r_2 \phi_2^2] + u_1 \phi_1^4 + u_2 \phi_2^4 + 2w \phi_1^2 \phi_2^2 \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where ϕ_1, ϕ_2 are n_1 -, n_2 -component fields with $n_1 + n_2 = N$. The stability of the fixed points (FP's) depends on the actual values of n_1, n_2 . According to the $O(\epsilon)$ analysis of Ref. [1], the bicritical $O(N)$ FP is stable for $N < N_c = 4 - 2\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2)$; for higher values of N the stable FP is tetracritical, described either by the biconal or the decoupled FP.

In the case of the SO(5) theory of superconductors $n_1 = 3, n_2 = 2$. The claim of Ref. [3] requires the stability of the O(5) FP. This apparently contradicts the $O(\epsilon)$ analysis of Ref. [1]. Moreover, Aharony argued in a Comment [5], using nonperturbative arguments, that the decoupled FP is stable. Then, assuming the existence of only one stable FP as suggested by ϵ expansion, he interpreted the MC results of Ref. [3] as a crossover starting close to the isotropic FP and slowly running to-

ward the stable FP or away to a first-order transition. But, as stressed by Hu in his reply [4], one cannot really exclude the possibility that two stable FP's may exist with distinct attraction domains, since arguments based on ϵ expansion cannot be considered as conclusive for three-dimensional systems.

This issue can be clarified by an analysis of the stability properties of the $O(N)$ FP under perturbations. We consider generic perturbations $\mathcal{P}_{ml}$ where m is the power of the fields and l the spin of the representation of the $O(N)$ group. For $m = 2$ (resp. 4), the only possible values of l are $l = 0, 2$ (resp. $l = 0, 2, 4$). Explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{2,0} &= \Phi^2, & \mathcal{P}_{2,2} &= \phi_1^2 - \frac{n_1}{N} \Phi^2, \\ \mathcal{P}_{4,0} &= (\Phi^2)^2, & \mathcal{P}_{4,2} &= \Phi^2 \left[\phi_1^2 - \frac{n_1}{N} \Phi^2 \right], \\ \mathcal{P}_{4,4} &= \phi_1^2 \phi_2^2 - \frac{\Phi^2(n_1 \phi_2^2 + n_2 \phi_1^2)}{N+4} + \frac{n_1 n_2 (\Phi^2)^2}{(N+2)(N+4)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where Φ is the N -component field (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) . The perturbations $\mathcal{P}_{2,0}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{2,2}$ are always relevant (with crossover exponents $\phi_{2,0} = 1$ and $\phi_{2,2} = 1.40(4)$ for $N = 5$). They must be tuned to approach a multicritical point. Field-theoretical analyses already applied to systems with cubic anisotropy [6], based on six-loop and five-loop series respectively in the framework of the fixed-dimension and ϵ expansions, show that the $O(N)$ FP is also unstable against the spin-4 perturbation $\mathcal{P}_{4,4}$ for $N > N_c$ with $N_c \lesssim 2.9$. Thus, we conclude that the bicritical O(5) FP is unstable, independently of the spin-2 perturbation $\mathcal{P}_{4,2}$. Therefore the enlargement of the symmetry to O(5) is not realized asymptotically: Beside the double tuning of $\mathcal{P}_{2,0}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{2,2}$ required by a multicritical point, one needs to tune (at least) a further relevant parameter to recover asymptotically the O(5) symmetry. However, we note that crossover effects due to the spin-4 perturbation $\mathcal{P}_{4,4}$ are characterized by a small crossover exponent $\phi_{4,4} = 0.145(7)$. This supports Aharony's interpretation of the MC results presented by Hu, in terms of a slow

crossover toward either the stable tetracritical decoupled FP or a weak first order transition.

We finally note that the above-reported arguments also apply to anisotropic antiferromagnetic systems. They show that the bicritical $O(3)$ -symmetric FP is unstable. In this case the crossover exponent is even much smaller: $\phi_{4,4} = 0.009(4)$. Moreover, one can argue, using Aharony's argument, that the decoupled FP is unstable too. The stable FP should be the biconal FP, which is expected to be close to the $O(3)$ FP, and therefore to have critical exponents very close to the Heisenberg ones.

-
- [1] J. M. Kosterlitz, D. R. Nelson, and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **13**, 412 (1976).
 - [2] S.-C. Zhang, Science **275**, 1089 (1997).
 - [3] X. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 057004 (2001).
 - [4] X. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 059704 (2002).
 - [5] A. Aharony, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 059703 (2002).
 - [6] J. M. Carmona, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 15136 (2000); A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, cond-mat/0012164, to appear in Phys. Rep., and references therein.